DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 402 814 HE 029 731

AUTHOR Bode, Rita Karwacki
TITLE Collegiality Encountered by New Faculty. ASHE Annual Meeting Paper.
INSTITUTION Rehabilitation Inst. of Chicago, Ill.
SPONS AGENCY National Center on Postsecondary Teaching, Learning, and Assessment, University Park, PA.
PUB DATE Nov 96
NOTE 18p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education (21st, Memphis, TN, October 31 - November 3, 1996).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Rank (Professional); Beginning Teachers; *College Faculty; *Collegiality; Cooperation; Data Analysis; Definitions; Educational Environment; Higher Education; Institutional Environment; Mentors; Nontenured Faculty; *Peer Relationship; Qualitative Research; *Research Methodology; Scholarship; Seniority; Sex Differences; *Social Support Groups; Surveys; Tenured Faculty
IDENTIFIERS *ASHE Annual Meeting

ABSTRACT

This qualitative study attempted to answer the question of what constitutes a collegial environment. New faculty members (N=258) at five institutions were surveyed and 92 new faculty were interviewed. The study utilized a methodology of quantifying data from interviews, the Rasch analytic technique, in which the definition of collegiality was separated from the rating of how collegial an environment was considered to be, thereby providing a common definition of collegiality on which faculty could rate their institutions. The study found that no respondents rated their institutions as uncollegial, a few rated them as very collegial and most rated them as average. The characteristic of whether new or other faculty initiated interactions was not perceived as related to collegiality. No gender differences in perceived collegiality were found. By rank, instructors and new faculty at institutions with no ranks rank rated their institutions as more collegial than those who were either tenured on the tenure track. New faculty at 2-year institutions rated their institutions as more collegial than those at 4-year institutions. The collegial environment was characterized by intellectual support and a sense of community, with support of new faculty's scholarly endeavors and reciprocal interactions between faculty members. (PRW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 402 814

COLLEGIALITY ENCOUNTERED BY NEW FACULTY

Rita Karwacki Bode

Rehabilitation Institute of Chicago

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the
Association for the Study of Higher Education, Memphis TN
November 1996

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

ASHE

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

ASHE

ASSOCIATION
FOR THE
STUDY OF
HIGHER EDUCATION

Texas A&M University
Department of Educational
Administration
College Station, TX 77843
(409) 845-0393

This paper was presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education held in Memphis, Tennessee, October 31 - November 3, 1996. This paper was reviewed by ASHE and was judged to be of high quality and of interest to others concerned with higher education. It has therefore been selected to be included in the ERIC collection of ASHE conference papers.

COLLEGIALITY ENCOUNTERED BY NEW FACULTY

Collegiality has been vaguely defined in Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary as marked by power or authority vested equally in each of a number of colleagues. The focus of this definition is on the equal status of individuals involved but does not address what characterizes a collegial environment. According to Bess (1992), despite some tacit appreciation, most working faculty don't even know what collegiality is. They claim that it is usually not present on their own campus but they wish it were. Before one can look at the effects of being in a collegial environment, a better understanding of what constitutes collegiality is necessary.

According to Dubin (1969), meaning can be established through validation using measurement theory. The validity of a term is indicated by a consensus that a concept can be measured through the use of some means of assessing empirically its value across different situations. Within each study of collegiality, it is operationalized by the specific items used to measure it and these meanings can vary from study to study. Unless consensus about its meaning can been reached, informal assessments of collegiality may yield confusing if not conflicting information about its meaning and value. However, as further noted by Dubin, consensus breaks down when an investigator raises questions about the empirical indicator based on evidence that is independent of the circumstances in which it is used; that is, how one defines collegiality may depend in part on whether one works in an institution where it exists. In essence, one needs to separate the characteristics of collegiality from the measure of how collegial an environment is.

In recent years, researchers have been looking at the issue of collegiality as it exists in institutions of higher learning. For example, Boice (1992) followed new faculty over a number of years and described their experiences with their new colleagues at their institutions. Hill, Bahniuk, and Dobos (1989) developed a measure which distinguished between mentoring and collegiality and determined what impact these had on faculty success. The methodologies used in these two studies differed substantially: Boice used qualitative research techniques to identify themes that ran through the responses of the new faculty whereas Hill, Dobos, and Bahniuk used communication support theory to guide in the development of a measure of the kinds of support that were influential in subsequent faculty success.

Results of recent studies have not been clearcut, possibly because of differences across respondents in the understanding of what collegiality means. In some instances collegiality is thought of as a social support system in which all members are equal in status and group acts as a community to which the new member is welcomed. In others, individual colleagues act as peer mentors for new faculty members and interact on a one-to-one basis. How new faculty rate their satisfaction with the collegiality they encounter can depend on what they think collegiality is. If there are differences in how people perceive of collegiality, it will be difficult to identify important factors in their development. According to Bess (1992), if collegiality is highly honored in theory but widely breached in practice, then change is in order and understanding it is the first prerequisite. The closer agreement can be reached about what constitutes collegiality, the better its elements can be controlled in ways that are beneficial to the educational enterprise.

What is a collegial environment? Is it one in which colleagues interact socially? Is it one in which colleagues with similar interests collaborate on scholarly activities? Is in one in which colleagues with dissimilar interests nevertheless respect each others' work? The purpose of this study is to provide an answer to these questions.

METHODOLOGY

To answer these questions, the traditional analytic techniques used in the past have tended to have shortcomings. The methodology used in this study represents a combination of qualitative and quantitative techniques to analyze data from both interviews and surveys to create a measure of collegiality that is separate from the rating of the extent to which it exists in an institution.

Sample

The data used in this study came from the New Faculty Project, a longitudinal study funded by the National Center for PostSecondary Teaching, Learning, and Assessment (NCTLA). Surveys were sent to all new faculty members at five institutions--two liberal arts colleges and one each community college district, research university, and comprehensive university. Of the 348 surveys sent and 258 were completed and returned. In addition to the surveys, 92 new faculty members were interviewed in person by experienced interviewers who recorded or summarized their responses (Menges, Barnhart, & Bode, 1995). Only faculty with both survey and interview data were included in the sample. This study is based on the first year's data since that data best described the environment encountered by new faculty.

Of the 92 faculty in this sample, 43 were male and 49 were female. By discipline, these faculty were distributed as follows: 37 were in the humanities, 23 were in the natural sciences, three were in professional fields, and 29 were in the social sciences. By rank, 44 were assistant professors, 11 were associate professors, and 4 were full professors; the remaining 29 faculty were instructors or were in institutions in which there were no ranks.

Instrumentation

New faculty members were surveyed midway in their first term at the new institution and shortly thereafter, they were interviewed. The interview questions provided the most useful information from which to create a measure of collegiality. (*Your further impressions about your institution come from colleagues. You may remember we asked about collegiality on the survey. The next few questions are structured questions about your relations with colleagues.*) New faculty were asked to give examples of the collegiality they had encountered. (*What are some examples of collegiality here?*) They were also asked to rate the quality of the support they received. (*On a scale from 1 to 10, how would you rate the quality of collegial support you are getting here (1=low and 10=high)?*)

Responses to survey items were included in the collegiality measure. The survey items used were as follows: (*Does the location of your office make it easy for you to work effectively with your colleagues? How many of your colleagues on campus can teach your course if you need to be elsewhere? How many of your colleagues on campus can give a constructive critique of your scholarly work?*)

Because the methodology used in this study represents a different approach to quantifying data from interviews, the procedures followed will be described in detail.

Analysis

This study combines the use of qualitative research techniques to identify characteristics of collegial environments with Rasch measurement techniques to create a measure of how collegial an environment is. While the responses to the survey items and the interview item rating the quality of support were numerical, the responses to the interview question concerning examples of collegiality were not. As such, the responses of this item needed to be analyzed before it could be included with the other responses to create a measure of collegiality. As with traditional qualitative research techniques (Miles & Huberman, 1994), the responses to this question were reviewed to abstract patterns or themes in the information provided. Major themes, that is, those which were mentioned by a substantial number of respondents, were treated as characteristics of collegial environments.

A thematic analysis was used to abstract themes from the responses to the interview question. Using a grounded approach which created a code-in-use rather than a predetermined coding scheme, several themes emerged. Because the intent of this study was to determine the characteristics of these environments rather than describe the participants in detail, a cross-case variable-oriented strategy was used to summarize the data.

Wright (1994) had previously shown how Rasch analysis can be used to display data from qualitative research. This use was extended to a Rasch analysis in which the themes were used to create "items" and the responses to these "items" were calibrated. In the creation of the measure of collegiality, Rasch calibrations are also used to determine the quality of the measures and guide the inclusion or exclusion of items to the scale.

This combination of techniques is similar to the use of open-ended questions on a small but relevant sample to determine the scope or content that should be covered in a survey that is to be administered to a wider population. Analyzing the responses to the interview item resulted in the development of various characteristics of environments that were empirically-based, that is, not based on preconceived notions of what collegiality is but on the new faculty's responses to this open-ended question.

Qualitative analysis

When analyzing data collected from interviews, one is working with words. Words have more meaning attached to them than numbers but are more difficult to summarize. Typically, these data are quantified by counting the occurrence of responses; using this approach, however, much information is lost. In analyzing interview data, one should preserve as much meaning as possible. This can be accomplished by coding the words with meaningful labels so that the information contained within the words can be organized and retrieved. Once the codes are created, they can be summarized into various themes or constructs, similar to cluster or factor analysis.

Coding interview responses: Responses to the interview question asking for examples of collegiality were analyzed using techniques described by Miles and Huberman (1994). Reviewing these responses lead to the development of a number of patterns or themes: whether the support received was social or intellectual in nature; the level of involvement of the other faculty; the level of reciprocity reflected in the actions of other faculty; which faculty initiated the interactions; the sense of community within the faculty as a whole; and the formality of the interactions among faculty. Another interesting theme that emerged was respect for the work of colleagues; however, because few responses gave clues as to the extent to which this characteristic was present in the environment, it could not be explored further.

Within each of these themes, different levels of the characteristic were apparent. In terms of the type of support received, there was a distinction between essentially social activities that consisted of welcoming the new faculty member to the social group and helping new faculty "learn the ropes" and essentially intellectual activities that consisted of assimilating new faculty members into the teaching and scholarly life of the academy. Three levels of involvement emerged from the responses: minimal involvement in which other faculty did not go out of their way to welcome the new members; moderate involvement in which other faculty went somewhat out of their way; and extensive involvement in which other faculty went out of their way to involve the new member of the faculty. Three levels were also found in terms of reciprocity. Relationships were essentially one-way in which other faculty gave advise or provided copies of syllabi to new faculty; more two-way in which the new faculty provided some input or their opinions were solicited; and collaborative in which new and other faculty worked together either socially or in terms of teaching or scholarly activities. Three levels of initiation of interactions were also found. In some cases, the new faculty member initiated the interaction; in others, other faculty initiated the interactions, and in still others, both new and other faculty initiated interactions. Two levels were found for sense of community: either a sense of community existed or it didn't exist. Finally, two levels were found for formality of interactions: the interactions were either formal or informal.

"Items" created: Once descriptors of these levels were established, it was possible to create "Items." From these data, the following "items" were created:

> Type of support: Responses to the interview item were categorized into two levels: social and intellectual. Social support consisted of both social activities and those which oriented the new faculty member to their environment

whereas intellectual support consisted of activities that related directly to teaching, research or scholarship. The assumption was that more collegial environments would be intellectually supportive.

The type of support provided was rated on a 2-point scale: social versus intellectual. Examples of responses that were classified as social are as follows:

people checking in, "give me a call"
people are friendly, going out to lunch with several
there's a good system for finding out rules
some are mundane, introductions to car pool

Examples of responses that were classified as intellectual are as follows:

talking about research or teaching problems
willing to discuss your work--and their work
I gave a seminar and immediate faculty feedback was helpful
Am asked to guest lecture outside department

Level of involvement: Responses to the interview item were categorized into three levels of involvement: minimal, moderate, and extensive. Minimal involvement would indicate that the faculty didn't go out of its way to welcome the new member; moderate involvement would indicate that the faculty went out of its way somewhat to welcome the new member; and extensive involvement would indicate that the faculty went far out of its way to welcome the new member. The assumption was that faculty in more collegial environments would be more involved in the professional lives of new members.

The level of involvement by other faculty was rated on a 3-point scale: minimal, moderate, and extensive. Examples of responses which were classified as representing minimal involvement on the part of other faculty are as follows:

They drop in to office to chat, non-business chat
Everyone introduces themselves
People ask "How are things going?"

Examples of responses which were classified as representing moderate involvement on the part of other faculty are as follows:

Meet for lunch but rarely for dinner because people commute
Guest lecture for each other
Share syllabi
On a professional level, they give me sample grants to follow

Examples of responses which were classified as representing extensive involvement on the part of other faculty are as follows:

I was entertained at many faculty homes, sometimes more than once
Most members of my department attend my performances
Team teaching, co-authoring
Collaborate on exams

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Reciprocity: Responses to the interview item were categorized into three levels of reciprocity: one-way interactions, two-way interactions, and collaboration. One-way interactions were those in which the new faculty member was the recipient of advice or information; two-way interactions were those in which the new member provided input into discussions or planning but was not an equal member of the group; and collaborative interactions were those in which the new faculty member was an active and equal participant in the teaching or research activity. The assumption was that more collegial environments would treat new members as having something important to contribute and would take advantage of the expertise of new members.

The reciprocity of the interactions was rated on a 3-point scale: one-way interactions, two-way interactions, and collaborations. Examples of responses which were classified as representing one-way interactions are as follows:

Help me to find an apartment to live in
Offered to review my work
Colleague got name tag for my door
Gets help mostly regarding advising

Examples of responses which were classified as representing two-way interactions are as follows:

Sharing and reading each other' work
Sit in on classes, swap syllabi
Shared exams, handouts, software
Team effort

Examples of responses which were classified as collaborative interactions are as follows:

Friends have written books [together]
Being prepped for a collaboratively-taught course
Some projects we work on together
Person I'm working most closely with tells people how glad he is that I'm here
Reading discussion groups

Responses to the interview question were categorized in terms of whether or not a sense of community existed. When a sense of community was existent, new and other faculty worked together as a community, had close bonds, or sense of family whereas when it was nonexistent, faculty worked independently. The assumption was that environments that had a sense of community would be more collegial.

The sense of community was rated on a 2-point scale: existent versus nonexistent. Examples of responses that were classified as not having a sense of community are as follows:

Not a spirit of interdisciplinary academic community; many small kingdoms
Lost in shuffle
Don't associate with everyone because each does their own thing
No one pays much attention because they are all busy

Examples of responses that were classified as having a sense of community are as follows:

> Other people in department attend our [art] shows
> Department gets along well; they respect each other's work
> I feel more "in the loop"
> Department has sense of family; friendly but can be intrusive

Responses to the interview item were categorized into two levels of formality of interactions: formal and informal. When interactions are formal, they were organized by the unit or college, such as orientation programs, mentoring programs, departmental meetings, etc.; when they were informal, individual faculty members interacted on their own initiative. The assumption was that environments in which interactions were more formal would be more collegial.

The formality of interactions was rated on a 2-point scale: formal versus informal. Examples of responses that were classified as representing formal interactions are as follows:

> We meet every week for "vision meetings"
> Mentor program
> New faculty orientation

Examples of responses that were classified as representing informal interactions are as follows:

> Department secretary was helpful
> People talk in the hallways about problems and successes
> They provide information when asked

Once these "items" were created, it was possible to rate each response in terms of the level of that characteristic that it represented. At times, the characteristic was specifically noted in the response; at others, the rating could be inferred. If the interview response contained no information by which a certain characteristic could be rated, it was coded as missing. Thus, from the responses that emerged from the responses, it was possible to abstract characteristics of the environment that could be used to describe its level of collegiality.

Rasch analysis

Typically, interview responses are coded and the codes are summarized into themes or patterns; then counts are made of the number of times specific codes or themes are mentioned. Quantitative analyses other than counts are usually not possible because of widespread missing data; that is, it would be unlikely for a specific code or theme to be present in the responses of all interviewees. With correlational analyses, variables with extensive missing data are deleted from the analysis or cases with missing data are dropped. Not deleting cases with incomplete data would result in having different samples of respondents for each comparison made between two variables. Thus, in attempting to analyze codes or themes from interview data, one would end up deleting all or most of the variables or dropping all or most of the cases. This would result in a severely limited analysis with few variables and cases.

In this study, instead of providing counts of respondents who mentioned each of the characteristics of a collegial environment, Rasch analysis was used to place the items on a continuum where one end represents less of the trait and the other, more of the trait--much like a ruler where one end represents less length and the other end represents more length. In this case, the trait in question is the collegiality of an environment; on this continuum, items at the bottom represent the most common characteristics of collegial environments and items at the top represent the least common characteristics of such environments. Once the position of the items along with continuum has been established, the position of individual environments as rated by new faculty are estimated. This position is estimated by comparing the response patterns for each individual to the ordered items to determine the point at which responses switch from presence of the characteristic to absence of the characteristic. Because the same metric is used to estimate the positions of both items and people on the continuum, it is possible to show the distribution of faculty ratings of how collegial they perceive their environments to be on the same scale as the distribution of the characteristics of collegiality.

An important feature of this methodology is the way in which missing data are dealt with. The use of Rasch methodology does not require deletion of cases with any missing data. Responses of new faculty didn't include comments on all the characteristics identified, so how can one ignore the missing data and make assumptions about how faculty would have responded on each characteristic? Rasch measurement treats the items as positions on a continuum based on the frequency with which they occur and bases the estimate of the amount of trait possessed by each individual on the scale positions of the items for which data were available. If you had a ruler on which some of the inch marks were missing, you could still measure a person by which inch points they were taller than and which they were shorted than; for instance, if all the odd-numbered inch markers were missing and a person was taller than the 60-inch point but shorter than the 62-inch point, you could estimate his/her height as between 60 and 62 inches. In the same way, you can estimate an individual's position on the continuum by the position of the items to which they responded.

Thus, even though there were missing data, one could still estimate how collegial a new faculty member perceived his/her new institution to be by the difficulty level of the characteristics which they mentioned. For example, if a response gave the indications that there was no sense of community, that there were no colleagues available in terms of teaching or critiquing their work but no indications of the level of involvement, level of reciprocity, quality of support, and so forth, based on the fact that the characteristics that were mentioned represented environments in which little or no collegiality existed, the assumption could be made that environments which did not possess these characteristics would not possess characteristics that were only found in more collegial environments.

At times, people respond in an unexpected manner. Those who report the presence of a less common characteristic could report the absence of a more common characteristic; in so doing, their responses would not fit the pattern established by the group as a whole. The extent to which the data for individuals fit this pattern is indicated by Rasch model fit statistics; a standardized fit statistic of 1.0 would indicate perfect fit and one of 2.0 would indicate significant misfit. The greater the misfit for a person, the more likely that his/her responses didn't fit the pattern defined by the group and the greater the misfit

for an item, the more likely that the item does not belong with the other items in defining the construct. Person fit is useful for showing if people responded carefully, and if not, their data should be deleted from the sample. Item fit is useful in determining if all the items are measuring the same construct.

Calibration of items: The ratings on each of the items created from the interview responses were calibrated for all new faculty using Rasch methodology. A preliminary analysis of the data from the interview item resulted in a scale with poor reliability (Bode, 1996). As with traditional composite scores, one way to improve the reliability of this measure is to include more items, that is, additional characteristics of the environment. Because of the brevity of the interview responses, it was difficult to rate responses on some additional themes abstracted from the data. Therefore, responses to other interview and survey were included in the development of this measure and the items were recalibrated.

Survey items that asked for the number of colleagues who could teach the new member's course or could critique their work were coded to create indicators of availability of colleagues. One can hypothesize that it would be difficult to perceive an environment in which no one else could teach your courses or critique your work as being collegial. Another interview item which asked the new faculty members to rate the quality of support received was also added to the scale. If the support received was of poor quality, it is doubtful if the environment could be considered collegial. Adding these and other items improved the reliability of the collegiality measure and created a measure that could be used to describe the collegiality of the environments of each of the participating institutions.

The survey items included in the collegiality measure were coded as follows:

*The quality of support was rated on a 10-point scale (1 = low, 10 = high).

*The convenience of the office location was rated on a two-point scale (1 = convenient, 0 = inconvenient).

*The number of colleagues on campus who could teach their course if they needed to be elsewhere was categorized as follows: (0 = none; 1-6 = some; more than 6 = many).

*The number of colleagues who could give a constructive critique of their scholarly work was categorized as follows: (0 = none; 1-6 = some; more than 6 = many).

RESULTS

The results from the final Rasch calibration are presented in Table 1. The quality of these calibrations are evaluated using two criteria: whether the items fit together and define a single construct and whether there is sufficient precision in the measurement to separate the environments into different levels of collegiality. The results show that, after two items were deleted, the items abstracted from the interview responses fit the Rasch model; that is, the standardized fit statistic (1.1) was not significant. The item that indicated who initiated the interactions did not fit the model; that is, faculty who perceived their institutions to be collegial were just as likely to have initiated the interactions as were other faculty. Precision is

indicated by the person separation reliability which is interpreted similarly to Cronbach's alpha. The results show the reliability of this measure (.61) to be acceptable; that is, the spread in the ratings is greater than the measurement error. Thus, variation in collegiality can be said to be due to true differences across institutions and not due just to the error involved in its measurement.

Table I

Results from Final Rasch Calibration

SUMMARY OF 92 MEASURED (NON-EXTREME) PERSONS

	RAW SCORE	COUNT	MEASURE	MODEL ERROR	INFIT MNSQ	INFIT ZSTD	OUTFIT MNSQ	OUTFIT ZSTD
MEAN	10.5	7.9	.13	.62	.94	-.2	.95	-.2
S.D.	3.7	1.3	1.02	.11	.66	.9	.59	.9

MODEL RMSE	.63	ADJ.SD	.79	SEPARATION	1.25	PERSON RELIABILITY	.61	
REAL RMSE	.73	ADJ.SD	.71	SEPARATION	.98	PERSON RELIABILITY	.49	
S.E. OF PERSON MEAN	.11							

VALID RESPONSES: 88.3%

SUMMARY OF 9 MEASURED (NON-EXTREME) ITEMS

	RAW SCORE	COUNT	MEASURE	MODEL ERROR	INFIT MNSQ	INFIT ZSTD	OUTFIT MNSQ	OUTFIT ZSTD
MEAN	161.4	81.2	.00	.23	.98	-.1	.97	-.2
S.D.	150.8	8.3	1.16	.07	.14	1.1	.14	.9

MODEL RMSE	.24	ADJ.SD	1.13	SEPARATION	4.66	ITEM RELIABILITY	.96	
REAL RMSE	.25	ADJ.SD	1.13	SEPARATION	4.52	ITEM RELIABILITY	.95	
S.E. OF ITEM MEAN	.41							

DELETED: 1 ITEMS

One way of describing the environments in terms of collegiality is to use the position of the characteristics (based on how commonly they were endorsed) to describe environments at various positions along the continuum. Figure 1 illustrates the use of item descriptors to describe how collegial new faculty perceive their environment to be. Gaps in the item descriptors are used to distinguish between different levels of collegiality. Two horizontal lines are drawn to show the gap between characteristics of moderately collegial environments from those which are more and less collegial. Because the estimates of persons and items are on the same scale, these lines can be extended to the distribution of measures of collegiality of environments to indicate which are the most collegial environments, which are the least collegial environments, and which are of average collegiality. The item descriptors can then be used to describe each of these three levels of collegiality.

In terms of the relationships hypothesized, the results show that in most institutions the support provided is social in nature whereas in those with the most collegiality, the support is also intellectual. A sense of community exists in some institutions with average collegiality but mainly in those with high collegiality. One-way interactions are most common in institutions but only in institutions with high collegiality are the interactions two-way or collaborative. The interactions in most institutions are informal; only in the most collegial institutions are they formal. The availability of colleagues who can teach the courses of the new faculty or critique their scholarly work increases with extent of collegiality: in institutions with low collegiality, there are no colleagues of theses types available but in institutions with high collegiality, there are many such colleagues. The quality of support also increases with extent of collegiality: in institutions with low collegiality, the quality is low whereas in institutions with high collegiality, the quality is high. Finally, convenience of office location is also related to the extent of collegiality within an institution: in institutions with low collegiality, the locations are inconvenient whereas in institutions with average or high collegiality, the locations are convenient.

The extent of collegiality within institutions can be described using these results. In this sample, no new faculty perceived his/her institution to be very uncollegial but that environment can still be described as follows:

(by extension) it possesses no sense of community
the location of the office of new faculty is inconvenient
there are no teaching colleagues available
there are no colleagues who can critique the work of new faculty
there is minimal involvement by other faculty
(by extension) there is no interactions between new and other faculty
the support that is provided is of poor quality
(by extension) neither social nor intellectual support is provided

The majority of new faculty members perceive their institutions to be moderately collegial; those environments can be described as follows:

they possess a sense of community to different extents
the location of the offices of new faculty is convenient
there are some teaching colleagues available
there are some colleagues who can critique the work of new faculty
there is moderate involvement by other faculty
interactions between new and other faculty are one-way
the support that is provided is of average quality
the support provided is social in nature

A few new faculty members perceive their institutions to be very collegial; those environments can be described as follows:

(by extension) they possess a sense of community
(by extension) the location of offices of new faculty is convenient
there are many teaching colleagues available
there are many colleagues who can critique the work of new faculty
there is extensive involvement by other faculty
interactions between new and other faculty are at least two-way
the support that is provided is of high quality
the support provided is social and intellectual in nature

Actual responses of new faculty who fall within the three levels of collegiality can be used to further describe these environments. A sample of an actual response for an environment rated as most collegial is: "very inviting place, people anxious to welcome you; team teaching, co-authoring, help with computer services; I also seek others out." A sample for an environment rated as average collegiality is: "baseball game with other faculty; they drop in to office to chat, non-business chat; exchange articles and clippings; dinner with prestigious campus speaker; dinner at homes of colleagues." A sample for an environment rated as the least collegial is: "[given] opportunity to learn how to teach, but if don't ask, nothing; lost in shuffle."

Discussion

As shown in Figure 1, while new faculty differed in the extent to which they rated their institutions as collegial, none rated them as uncollegial, few rated them as very collegial and most rated them as being of average collegiality. Of the characteristics of collegial environments, most were related to overall collegiality in the hypothesized direction. One characteristic that did not fit this pattern was whether new or the other faculty initiated the interactions. This characteristic was not related to collegiality; collegial institutions are not necessarily only those in which other faculty initiate the interactions. Initiation of interactions by new faculty is described by Boice (1992) as a characteristic of "fast starters"; they do not wait for other faculty members to initiate interactions but take it upon themselves to seek information or feedback from other faculty.

To see if there were any patterns in perceptions of collegiality, collegiality measures were summarized separately by gender, type of institution, and rank. There were no gender differences in perceived collegiality which was unexpected in view of perceived "hostile environments" for female faculty. There was a difference, however, by type of institution: new faculty at 2-year institutions rated their institutions as more collegial than those at 4-year institutions. In other results from the New Faculty Project, faculty at 2-year institutions were also more satisfied and reported less academic stress (Menges, Barnhart, and Bode, 1995). These results appear to confirm the atmosphere at 2-year institutions as more conducive for new faculty. By rank, instructors and new faculty at institutions with no ranks (who are at 2-year institutions) rated their institutions as more collegial than those who were either tenured or on the tenure track (who are at 4-year institutions). Among professors, assistant and associate professors rated their institutions as more collegial than full professors.

According to Bess (1992), one needs to separate the definition of a collegiality from the rating of how collegial an environment is. These results show that using Rasch analytic techniques that this is possible. As seen in Figure 1, collegiality is defined by items that represented the most to the least common characteristics of a collegial environment and the ratings of the collegiality of these environments is shown by the distribution of ratings. Basing the characteristics of collegial environments on the responses of faculty themselves provides a more empirically-based approach and using Rasch techniques provides a common definition of collegiality on which faculty can rate their institutions. If new faculty had just been asked to rate how collegial their institution was, they would have been rating it using their own criteria as to what

Figure 1. Person and Item Map for Collegiality Measure

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

constituted a collegial institution and these criteria could have differed across faculty. Instead in this analysis, all new faculty rated the collegiality of their institutions based on the same characteristics which was a composite of the characteristics mentioned by at least some of the respondents.

While these results show this combinations of procedures to be promising, more reliable estimates could be obtained if more characteristics could be abstracted from the interview responses. Perhaps someone more experienced with the qualitative methods used could have detected additional themes in the responses. Also, if the responses themselves were more elaborate, additional themes could probably have been detected.

The characteristics identified in this study could be used to create survey items that could then be administered to another larger sample to determine how well they generalize beyond this sample. As with the use of open-ended questions as an initial step in determining the content that should be included in a large-scale survey, abstracting themes from interview responses can be a useful first step in defining a construct. This allows the creation of a construct that is empirically based and the development of theories about the role of collegiality in higher education.

Conclusions

The environments of institutions of higher learning vary in the extent of collegiality within them. Institutions which are more collegial provide high-quality intellectual support and they possess a sense of community, colleagues are available to support new faculty in scholarly endeavors, they are extensively involved with new faculty, and their interactions are reciprocal. According to Boice (1992), impediments to collegiality within a postsecondary educational institution may be due to differences in expectations and mission of new, more research-oriented faculty versus senior teaching-oriented faculty, conflicts in philosophy, or competition among subunits for resources and power.

Regarding the methodology used in this study, characteristics derived from the interviews were useful in creating items for a survey of collegiality encountered. The characteristics created for collegiality lent themselves to a unidimensional continuum in which some were more likely to be found in a collegial environment and some were less likely to be found in a collegial environment. The combination of techniques used provided both the raw data on which the analyses could be performed and the methods by which useful information could be obtained about the patterns existing in these data.

References

Bess, J.L. (1992). Collegiality: Toward a clarification of meaning and function. In J. C. Smart (Ed.), Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research, pp. 1-36. New York: Agathon Press.

Bode, R.K. (1996, May). Defining the collegiality of an environment. Paper presented at the Midwest Objective Measurement Seminar, Chicago IL.

Boice, R. (1992). The new faculty member: Supporting and fostering professional development. San Francisco:Jossey-Bass.

Dubin, R. (1969). *Theory Building*. New York: The Free Press.

Hill, S.E. Kogler, Bahniuk, M.H., & Dobos, J. (1989). The impact of mentoring and collegial support on faculty success: An analysis of support behavior, information adequacy, and apprehension. Communication Education. 38, 15-33.

Menges, R.J., Barnhart, B., & Bode, R.K. (1995). Report on the New Faculty Project. National Center for PostSecondary Teaching, Learning and Assessment. Evanston IL: Northwestern University.

Miles, M.B. & Huberman, A. M. (1994). Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook. Thousand Oaks CA, Sage Publications.

Wright, B.D. (1995). Learning from qualitative data analysis. Rasch Measurement Transactions, 9(1), 405-407.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE